

Stationary max-stable processes with the Markov property

Clément Dombry* and Frédéric Eyi-Minko†

Abstract

We prove that the class of discrete time stationary max-stable process satisfying the Markov property is equal, up to time reversal, to the class of stationary max-autoregressive processes of order 1. A similar statement is also proved for continuous time processes.

Key words: max-stable process, Markov property, max-autoregressive process. **AMS Subject classification. Primary:** 60G70, **Secondary:** 60J05.

1 Introduction

Given a class of stochastic processes, a natural and important question is to determine conditions ensuring the Markov property. For example, a zero mean Gaussian process X on $T = \mathbb{Z}$ or $\mathbb{R}$ satisfies the Markov property if and only if

$$\mathbb{E}[X(t_2) \mid X(t), t \leq t_1] = \mathbb{E}[X(t_2) \mid X(t_1)] \quad \text{for all } t_1, t_2 \in T, t_1 \leq t_2.$$

It is also well known that if X is a *stationary* zero mean Gaussian processes on T satisfying the Markov property, then X must be the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process with covariance function

$$\mathbb{E}[X(t_1)X(t_2)] = \mathbb{E}[X(0)^2]e^{-\lambda|t_2-t_1|}$$

*Université de Poitiers, Laboratoire de Mathématiques et Applications, UMR CNRS 7348, Téléport 2, BP 30179, F-86962 Futuroscope-Chasseneuil cedex, France. Email: Clement.Dombry@math.univ-poitiers.fr

†Université de Poitiers, Laboratoire de Mathématiques et Applications, UMR CNRS 7348, Téléport 2, BP 30179, F-86962 Futuroscope-Chasseneuil cedex, France. Email: Frederic.Eyi.minko@math.univ-poitiers.fr

for some $\lambda \in [0, +\infty]$. The case $\lambda = 0$ corresponds to a constant process, the case $\lambda = +\infty$ to a Gaussian white noise.

Within the class of symmetric α -stable (S α S) processes, the situation is much more complicated (see Adler *et al.* [1]). No complete characterization of S α S Markov processes is known but only necessary or sufficient conditions. One can construct at least two classes of stationary Markov S α S processes, the right and the left S α S Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes.

The purpose of this paper is to study the Markov property within the class of max-stable random processes. Without loss of generality, we shall consider only *simple* max-stable processes defined as follows.

Definition 1. A random process $\eta = (\eta(t))_{t \in T}$ is said to be *simple max-stable* if it has 1-Fréchet marginals

$$\mathbb{P}[\eta(t) \leq y] = \exp(-1/y), \quad \text{for all } t \in T, \ y > 0,$$

and satisfies the following max-stability property:

$$n^{-1} \bigvee_{i=1}^n \eta_i \stackrel{d}{=} \eta, \quad \text{for all } n \geq 1,$$

where $(\eta_i)_{i \geq 1}$ are independent copies of η and $\bigvee$ denotes pointwise maximum, $\stackrel{d}{=}$ equality of distributions.

Our main result is a complete characterization of the class of stationary simple max-stable Markov processes on $T = \mathbb{Z}$ or $\mathbb{R}$. Our analysis relies on a recent paper [7] where explicit formulas for the conditional distributions of max-stable processes are proved. This helps clarifying the notion of (Markovian) dependence for max-stable processes.

Related works by Tavares [16], Alpuim [2], Alpuim *et al.* [3] characterized stationary max-AR(1) processes, and Alpuim *et al.* [4] study max-autoregressive processes and the Markov property in extreme value theory. Extremes of Markov chains have been considered by Perfekt [11] and Smith [14], while Smith *et al.* [15] consider Markov chain models for threshold exceedances (see the monograph by Beirlant *et al.* section 10.4 for further discussion on extremes and Markov chains).

Well known examples of discrete time simple max-stable processes satisfying the Markov property are maximum-autoregressive processes of order 1. The max-AR(1) process with parameter $a \in [0, 1]$ is defined as follows: consider $(F_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ a sequence of i.i.d. random variables with standard 1-Fréchet distribution and set

$$X_a(t) = \begin{cases} (1-a) \bigvee_{n \leq t} a^{t-n} F_n & \text{if } a \in [0, 1) \\ X_1(t) \equiv F_0 & \text{if } a = 1 \end{cases}, \quad t \in \mathbb{Z}. \quad (1)$$

The max-AR(1) process X_a is a stationary simple max-stable process satisfying

$$X_a(t+1) = \max(aX_a(t), (1-a)F_{t+1}), \quad t \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

This relation explains the term max-autoregressive and implies that X_a satisfies the Markov property. The associated Markov kernel $K_a(x, \cdot)$ is defined by

$$K_a(x, dy) = \mathbb{P}[X_a(t+1) \in dy \mid X_a(t) = x]$$

and is easily computed: noting δ_z the Dirac measure at point z , it holds

$$K_a(x, dy) = e^{-(1-a)/(ax)} \delta_{ax}(dy) + (1-a)y^{-2}e^{-(1-a)/y} 1_{\{y > ax\}} dy.$$

Note that the parameter $a \in [0, 1]$ tunes the strength of the dependence, ranging from independence when $a = 0$ to complete dependence when $a = 1$. It can be retrieved from the support of the law of $X_a(t+1)/X_a(t)$ since

$$\text{supp}(X_a(t+1)/X_a(t)) = [a, +\infty) \quad \text{if } a \in [0, 1),$$

and the support is reduced to $\{1\}$ in the case $a = 1$.

It is well known that if $X = (X(t))_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is a stationary Markov chain, then the time reversed process $\check{X} = (X(-t))_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is also a stationary Markov chain. Hence, time reversed max-autoregressive processes are further examples of stationary max-stable Markov processes. More precisely, if X_a is the max-AR(1) process (1), the associated time reversed process $\check{X}_a$ is given by

$$\check{X}_a(t) = (1-a) \bigvee_{n \geq t} a^{n-t} \check{F}_n, \quad t \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad (2)$$

where $(\check{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} = (F_{-n})_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ are i.i.d. random variables with standard 1-Fréchet distribution. Clearly, $\check{X}_a$ satisfies the backward max-autoregressive relation

$$\check{X}_a(t-1) = \max(a\check{X}_a(t), (1-a)\check{F}_{t-1}), \quad t \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

The Markov kernel associated to $\check{X}_a$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \check{K}_a(y, dx) &= \mathbb{P}[\check{X}_a(t+1) \in dx \mid \check{X}_a(t) = y] \\ &= a\delta_{y/a}(dx) + (1-a)x^{-2}e^{-1/x+a/y} 1_{\{x < y/a\}} dx. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the Markov kernels K_a and $\check{K}_a$ are related by the equilibrium relation

$$\pi(dx)K_a(x, dy) = \pi(dy)\check{K}_a(y, dx)$$

where $\pi(dx) = x^{-2}e^{-1/x} 1_{\{x > 0\}} dx$ is the stationary distribution. It is easily seen that for $a = 0$ or $a = 1$, X_a and $\check{X}_a$ have the same distribution. This

means that the max-AR(1) process X_a is reversible if $a = 0$ or $a = 1$. This is no longer the case when $a \in (0, 1)$ since

$$\text{supp}(\check{X}_a(t+1)/\check{X}_a(t)) = [0, 1/a] \quad \text{if } a \in (0, 1).$$

The purpose of the present paper is the characterization of all stationary simple max-stable processes satisfying the Markov property.

Theorem 1. *Any stationary simple max-stable process $\eta = (\eta(t))_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ satisfying the Markov property is equal in distribution to a max-AR(1) process (1) or to a time-reversed max-AR(1) process (2).*

The structure of the paper is the following. In section 2, we gather some preliminaries on max-stable processes and their representations that will be useful in our approach. Section 3 is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1. An extension to continuous time processes is considered in section 4.

2 Preliminaries on max-stable processes

2.1 Representations of max-stable processes

Our approach relies on the following representation of simple max-stable process due to de Haan [6], see also Penrose [10] and Schlather [13]. The symbol $\stackrel{d}{=}$ stand for equality in distribution.

Theorem 2. *Let $\eta = (\eta(t))_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ be a simple max-stable process on $\mathbb{Z}$. Then, there exists a nonnegative random process Y such that*

$$\mathbb{E}[Y(t)] = 1 \quad \text{for all } t \in \mathbb{Z}, \tag{3}$$

and

$$\left(\eta(t)\right)_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} \stackrel{d}{=} \left(\bigvee_{i \geq 1} U_i Y_i(t)\right)_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}, \tag{4}$$

where $(Y_i)_{i \geq 1}$ are i.i.d. copies of Y and $\{U_i, i \geq 1\}$ is a Poisson point process on $(0, +\infty)$ with intensity $u^{-2}du$ and independent of $(Y_i)_{i \geq 1}$.

The random process Y is called a spectral process associated to η . Conversely, we call η the max-stable process associated to Y .

Consider the function space $\mathcal{F} = [0, +\infty)^{\mathbb{Z}}$ endowed with the product sigma-algebra and $\mathcal{F}_0 = \mathcal{F} \setminus \{0\}$. The exponent measure of η is defined by

$$\mu(A) = \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}[uY \in A] u^{-2} dy, \quad A \in \mathcal{F}_0 \text{ measurable.} \tag{5}$$

It does not depend on the choice of the spectral process Y but only on the distribution of η . It satisfies the homogeneity property

$$\mu(uA) = u^{-1}\mu(A), \quad u > 0, \quad A \in \mathcal{F}_0 \text{ measurable},$$

and is related to η by the relations

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}[\eta(t_1) \leq z_1, \dots, \eta(t_k) \leq z_k] \\ &= \exp \left(-\mu\{f \in \mathcal{F}; f(t_i) > z_i \text{ for some } 1 \leq i \leq k\} \right) \end{aligned}$$

for all $k \geq 1$, $t_1, \dots, t_k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $z_1, \dots, z_k \geq 0$.

Note that there is no uniqueness for the representation (4). We introduce therefore the following notion of equivalent spectral processes.

Definition 2. *Let Y and Y' be nonnegative stochastic processes satisfying*

$$\mathbb{E}[Y(t)] = \mathbb{E}[Y'(t)] = 1, \quad t \in \mathbb{Z}. \quad (6)$$

We say that Y and Y' are equivalent if and only if the associated max-stable processes have the same distribution.

The following property will be useful. A subset $C \subset \mathcal{F}$ is called a cone if and only if $f \in C$ implies $uf \in C$ for all $u \geq 0$.

Proposition 1. *Let Y and Y' be equivalent processes as in Definition 2. Let $C \subset \mathcal{F}$ be a measurable cone such that $\mathbb{P}[Y \in C] = 1$. Then, $\mathbb{P}[Y' \in C] = 1$.*

Proof. Let μ (resp. μ') be the exponent measure of the max-stable process associated to Y (resp. Y') by Equation (5). Clearly, Y and Y' are equivalent if and only if the exponent measures μ and μ' are equal. On the other hand, Equation (5) implies clearly that $\mathbb{P}[Y \in C] = 1$ if and only if μ is supported by C , i.e. $\mu[\mathcal{F} \setminus C] = 0$. Similarly $\mathbb{P}[Y' \in C] = 1$ if and only if $\mu'[\mathcal{F} \setminus C] = 0$.

Using this, we deduce easily that if Y and Y' are equivalent processes with $\mathbb{P}[Y \in C] = 1$, then $\mu = \mu'$ is supported by C and $\mathbb{P}[Y' \in C] = 1$. $\square$

2.2 Brown-Resnick stationary processes

In the following we focus on stationary max-stable processes. A random process $X = (X(t))_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is called stationary if X and $X(\cdot + s)$ have the same distribution for all $s \in \mathbb{Z}$. We use the following terminology, due to Kabluchko *et al.* [8].

Definition 3. *A nonnegative random process Y satisfying (3) is called Brown-Resnick stationary if the associated max-stable process η defined by (4) is stationary.*

It follows from the definition that Y is Brown-Resnick stationary if and only if Y and $Y(\cdot + s)$ are equivalent (in the sense of Definition 2) for all $s \in \mathbb{Z}$. Proposition 1 implies then the following result.

Proposition 2. *Let Y be a Brown-Resnick stationary process and let $C \subset \mathcal{F}$ be a measurable cone such that $\mathbb{P}[Y \in C] = 1$. Then, for all $s \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\mathbb{P}[Y(\cdot + s) \in C] = 1$. Furthermore, noting $\theta_s : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ the shift operator defined by $\theta_s(f) = f(\cdot + s)$, it holds*

$$\mathbb{P}\left[Y \in \bigcap_{s \in \mathbb{Z}} \theta_s(C)\right] = 1.$$

Proof. As we noticed, if Y is Brown-Resnick stationary, then Y and $Y(\cdot + s)$ are equivalent for all $s \in \mathbb{Z}$. The result follows then directly from Proposition 1 by setting $Y' = Y(\cdot + s)$. For the last statement, if $\mathbb{P}[Y \in C] = 1$, then $\mathbb{P}[Y \in \theta_s(C)] = 1$ for all $s \in \mathbb{Z}$, whence we deduce $\mathbb{P}[Y \in \bigcap_{s \in \mathbb{Z}} \theta_s(C)] = 1$. $\square$

The following lemma will also be useful in order to prove equivalence of processes. For $f_0 \in \mathcal{F}$, we note $C_{inv}(f_0) = \{uf_0(\cdot + s); u \geq 0, s \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ the smallest shift-invariant cone containing f_0 .

Lemma 1. *Let Y and Y' be Brown-Resnick stationary processes satisfying (6) and such that*

$$\mathbb{P}[Y \in C_{inv}(f_0)] = \mathbb{P}[Y' \in C_{inv}(f_0)] = 1 \quad \text{for some } f_0 \in \mathcal{F}.$$

Then Y and Y' are equivalent.

Proof. We note μ and μ' the exponent measure of the max-stable processes associated to Y and Y' respectively. Clearly the measure μ (and also μ') satisfies the following four properties:

- i) μ is -1 -homogeneous;
- ii) $\mu(\{f \in \mathcal{F}; f(0) \geq 1\}) = 1$;
- iii) μ is shift-invariant;
- iv) μ is supported by $C_{inv}(f_0)$.

Recall indeed that properties i) and ii) are satisfied for all exponent measure, that iii) holds if and only if the spectral process Y is Brown-Resnick stationary and that iv) is equivalent to $\mathbb{P}[Y \in C_{inv}(f_0)] = 1$.

We will prove below that there exists at most one measure μ on $\mathcal{F}_0$ satisfying the four properties i)-iv). Since μ' satisfies the same properties, we deduce that $\mu = \mu'$, whence Y and Y' are equivalent.

For $g \in \mathcal{F}$, we note $C(g) = \{ug; u \geq 0\}$ the smallest cone containing g . Clearly, $C_{inv}(f_0) = \cup_{s \in \mathbb{Z}} C(f_s)$ with $f_s = \theta_s f_0$. The different cones in the union may have non trivial intersections and two cases occur.

- First case: there is $s_0 \geq 1$ such that $C(f_{s_0}) \cap C(f_0) \neq \{0\}$.
Without loss of generality, we can suppose that s_0 is minimal with this property. Then,

$$C_{inv}(f) = \cup_{0 \leq s \leq s_0-1} C(f_s)$$

and

$$C(f_s) \cap C(f_{s'}) = \{0\}, \quad 0 \leq s \neq s' \leq s_0 - 1.$$

- Second case: for all $s \geq 1$, $C(f_s) \cap C(f) = \{0\}$.
Then

$$C_{inv}(f) = \cup_{s \in \mathbb{Z}} C(f_s) \quad \text{and} \quad C(f_s) \cap C(f_{s'}) = \{0\}, \quad s \neq s'.$$

We give the proof in the first case only, the second case follows from straightforward modifications. The support property iv) implies that $\mu = \sum_{s=0}^{s_0-1} \mu_s$ where μ_s is the restriction of μ to $C(f_s)$. The homogeneity property i) entails that the restriction μ_s is completely determined by the real parameter $\alpha_s = \mu(\{uf_s; u \geq 1\})$. It holds indeed

$$\mu_s(\{uf_s; u \geq v\}) = v^{-1} \mu_s(\{uf_s; u \geq 1\}) = \alpha_s v^{-1}, \quad v > 0.$$

Furthermore, the shift invariance property iii) implies that $\alpha_s \equiv \alpha$ does not depend on s . Finally, the real parameter α is determined by the normalization property ii): we have indeed

$$\mu(\{f \in \mathcal{F}; f(0) \geq 1\}) = \sum_{s=0}^{s_0-1} \mu_s(\{f \in \mathcal{F}; f(0) \geq 1\}) = \alpha \sum_{s=0}^{s_0-1} f_0(s)$$

whence property ii) yields $\alpha = (\sum_{s=0}^{s_0-1} f_0(s))^{-1}$. This proves that μ is completely determined by properties i)-iv) and completes the proof of the lemma. $\square$

2.3 Conditional distributions

Our study of the Markov property for max-stable process relies on explicit formulas for the regular conditional distributions of max-stable process established in Dombry and Eyi-Minko [7]. The following expression for the conditional distribution function will be useful (see Proposition 4.1 in [7]).

Proposition 3. *Let η be a simple max-stable process with representation (4). For every $t, t_1, \dots, t_k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $z, z_1, \dots, z_k > 0$*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}[\eta(t_1) \leq z_1, \dots, \eta(t_k) \leq z_k \mid \eta(t) = z] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[1_{\{\bigvee_{i=1}^k \frac{Y(t_i)}{z_i} \leq \frac{Y(t)}{z}\}} Y(t)\right] \exp\left(-\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\bigvee_{i=1}^k \frac{Y(t_i)}{z_i} - \frac{Y(t)}{z}\right)^+\right]\right), \end{aligned}$$

with $(x)^+ = \max(x, 0)$.

We can deduce the following well known result, that we prove here for the sake of completeness.

Proposition 4. *Let η be a simple max-stable process with representation (4) and consider $t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then $\eta(t_1)$ and $\eta(t_2)$ are independent if and only if*

$$\mathbb{P}[Y(t_1) = 0 \text{ or } Y(t_2) = 0] = 1.$$

Proof. The random variables $\eta(t_1)$ and $\eta(t_2)$ are independent if and only if

$$\mathbb{P}[\eta(t_1) \leq z_1 \mid \eta(t_2) = z_2] = \mathbb{P}[\eta(t_1) \leq z_1], \quad z_1, z_2 > 0.$$

Using Proposition 3 and the fact that $\eta(t_1)$ has a standard 1-Fréchet distribution, this is equivalent to

$$\mathbb{E}\left[1_{\{\frac{Y(t_1)}{z_1} \leq \frac{Y(t_2)}{z_2}\}} Y(t_2)\right] \exp\left(-\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{Y(t_1)}{z_1} - \frac{Y(t_2)}{z_2}\right)^+\right]\right) = \exp\left(-\frac{1}{z_1}\right)$$

for all $z_1, z_2 > 0$. Setting $z = z_1$ and $c = z_1/z_2$, the equation becomes

$$\mathbb{E}\left[1_{\{Y(t_1) \leq cY(t_2)\}} Y(t_2)\right] \exp\left(-\mathbb{E}\left[(Y(t_1) - cY(t_2))^+\right]/z\right) = \exp\left(-1/z\right).$$

This relation is satisfied for all $z, c > 0$ if and only if

$$\mathbb{E}\left[1_{\{Y(t_1) \leq cY(t_2)\}} Y(t_2)\right] = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}\left[(Y(t_1) - cY(t_2))^+\right] = 1, \quad c > 0.$$

Using $\mathbb{E}[Y(t_1)] = \mathbb{E}[Y(t_2)] = 1$, one can easily prove that this holds true if and only if

$$\mathbb{P}[Y(t_1) = 0 \text{ or } Y(t_2) = 0] = 1.$$

□

3 Proof of Theorem 1

3.1 A property of max-stable Markov processes

The following result is the central tool in our proof of Theorem 1. Note that no stationarity assumption is required at this stage.

Proposition 5. *Let $\eta = (\eta(t))_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ be a simple max-stable process with representation (4). For $t, t' \in \mathbb{Z}$, we denote by $\alpha_{t,t'}$ the essential infimum of the random variable $Y(t')/Y(t)$ conditionally on $Y(t) > 0$, i.e.*

$$\alpha_{t,t'} = \inf\{c > 0; \mathbb{P}[Y(t')/Y(t) \leq c \mid Y(t) > 0] > 0\}. \quad (7)$$

If η satisfies the Markov property, then, for all $t_1 < t < t_2$,

$$\mathbb{P}[Y(t_1) = \alpha_{t,t_1} Y(t) \mid Y(t) > 0] = 1 \quad \text{or} \quad \mathbb{P}[Y(t_2) = \alpha_{t,t_2} Y(t) \mid Y(t) > 0] = 1.$$

Proof of Proposition 5. First note that the definition (7) entails

$$\mathbb{P}[Y(t') \geq \alpha_{t,t'} Y(t) \mid Y(t) > 0] = 1.$$

Hence, in order to prove Proposition 5, it is enough to prove

$$\mathbb{P}[Y(t_1) \leq \alpha_{t,t_1} Y(t) \mid Y(t) > 0] = 1 \quad \text{or} \quad \mathbb{P}[Y(t_2) \leq \alpha_{t,t_2} Y(t) \mid Y(t) > 0] = 1,$$

or equivalently that, for all $c_1 > \alpha_{t,t_1}$ and all $c_2 > \alpha_{t,t_2}$,

$$\mathbb{P}[Y(t_1) \leq c_1 Y(t) \mid Y(t) > 0] = 1 \quad \text{or} \quad \mathbb{P}[Y(t_2) \leq c_2 Y(t) \mid Y(t) > 0] = 1. \quad (8)$$

We now prove Equation (8). We use the fact that the past and the future of a Markov chain are independent conditionally on the present. More formally, for all $t_1 < t < t_2$ and $z, z_1, z_2 > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}[\eta(t_1) \leq z_1, \eta(t_2) \leq z_2 \mid \eta(t) = z] \\ &= \mathbb{P}[\eta(t_1) \leq z_1 \mid \eta(t) = z] \mathbb{P}[\eta(t_2) \leq z_2 \mid \eta(t) = z]. \end{aligned}$$

Using the explicit expression for the conditional cumulative distribution function given in Proposition 3, this is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}\left[1_{\left\{\frac{Y(t_1)}{z_1} \vee \frac{Y(t_2)}{z_2} \leq \frac{Y(t)}{z}\right\}} Y(t)\right] \exp\left(-\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{Y(t_1)}{z_1} \vee \frac{Y(t_2)}{z_2} - \frac{Y(t)}{z}\right)^+\right]\right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[1_{\left\{\frac{Y(t_1)}{z_1} \leq \frac{Y(t)}{z}\right\}} Y(t)\right] \exp\left(-\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{Y(t_1)}{z_1} - \frac{Y(t)}{z}\right)^+\right]\right) \\ & \quad \times \mathbb{E}\left[1_{\left\{\frac{Y(t_2)}{z_2} \leq \frac{Y(t)}{z}\right\}} Y(t)\right] \exp\left(-\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{Y(t_2)}{z_2} - \frac{Y(t)}{z}\right)^+\right]\right). \end{aligned}$$

Using the formula $a + b = a \wedge b + a \vee b$, this last equation simplifies into

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}\left[1_{\left\{\frac{Y(t_1)}{z_1} \vee \frac{Y(t_2)}{z_2} \leq \frac{Y(t)}{z}\right\}} Y(t)\right] \exp\left(\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{Y(t_1)}{z_1} \wedge \frac{Y(t_2)}{z_2} - \frac{Y(t)}{z}\right)^+\right]\right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[1_{\left\{\frac{Y(t_1)}{z_1} \leq \frac{Y(t)}{z}\right\}} Y(t)\right] \mathbb{E}\left[1_{\left\{\frac{Y(t_2)}{z_2} \leq \frac{Y(t)}{z}\right\}} Y(t)\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, setting $z_1 = c_1 z$ and $z_2 = c_2 z$ with $c_1, c_2, z > 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}\left[1_{\left\{\frac{Y(t_1)}{c_1} \vee \frac{Y(t_2)}{c_2} \leq Y(t)\right\}} Y(t)\right] \exp\left(\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{z} \left(\frac{Y(t_1)}{c_1} \wedge \frac{Y(t_2)}{c_2} - Y(t)\right)^+\right]\right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[1_{\left\{\frac{Y(t_1)}{c_1} \leq Y(t)\right\}} Y(t)\right] \mathbb{E}\left[1_{\left\{\frac{Y(t_2)}{c_2} \leq Y(t)\right\}} Y(t)\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the right hand side of this equality does not depend on $z > 0$ and is positive as soon as $c_1 > \alpha_{t,t_1}$ and $c_2 > \alpha_{t,t_2}$ (this is a simple consequence of the definition (7)). Then, the exponential factor in the left hand side must be constant and equal to 1. We deduce that, for all $c_1 > \alpha_{t,t_1}, c_2 > \alpha_{t,t_2}$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[1_{\left\{\frac{Y(t_1)}{c_1} \vee \frac{Y(t_2)}{c_2} \leq Y(t)\right\}} Y(t)\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[1_{\left\{\frac{Y(t_1)}{c_1} \leq Y(t)\right\}} Y(t)\right] \mathbb{E}\left[1_{\left\{\frac{Y(t_2)}{c_2} \leq Y(t)\right\}} Y(t)\right] \quad (9)$$

and also

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\frac{Y(t_1)}{c_1} \wedge \frac{Y(t_2)}{c_2} \leq Y(t)\right] = 1. \quad (10)$$

Let us introduce the probability measure $\hat{\mathbb{P}}_t(\cdot) = \mathbb{E}[1_{\{\cdot\}} Y(t)]$ and the events

$$A_1 = \left\{\frac{Y(t_1)}{c_1} \leq Y(t)\right\} \quad \text{and} \quad A_2 = \left\{\frac{Y(t_2)}{c_2} \leq Y(t)\right\}.$$

With these notations, Equation (9) becomes

$$\hat{\mathbb{P}}_t[A_1 \cap A_2] = \hat{\mathbb{P}}_t[A_1] \hat{\mathbb{P}}_t[A_2]$$

and states that the events A_1 and A_2 are $\hat{\mathbb{P}}_t$ -independent. On the other hand, Equation (9) yields $\mathbb{P}[A_1 \cup A_2] = 1$ which clearly implies $\hat{\mathbb{P}}_t[A_1 \cup A_2] = 1$. Taking the complementary set, we obtain $\hat{\mathbb{P}}_t[A_1^c \cap A_2^c] = 0$ and, from the independence of A_1 and A_2 , $\hat{\mathbb{P}}_t[A_1^c] \hat{\mathbb{P}}_t[A_2^c] = 0$. Thus, we have $\hat{\mathbb{P}}_t[A_1^c] = 0$ or $\hat{\mathbb{P}}_t[A_2^c] = 0$. Finally, the probability measures $\hat{\mathbb{P}}_t[\cdot]$ and $\mathbb{P}[\cdot \mid Y(t) > 0]$ are equivalent in the sense that they have the same null sets. Hence, it holds

$$\mathbb{P}[A_1^c \mid Y(t) > 0] = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad \mathbb{P}[A_2^c \mid Y(t) > 0] = 0.$$

This is equivalent to Equation (8) and this concludes the proof of Proposition 5. $\square$

3.2 A characterization of max-AR(1) processes

We provide a simple characterization of max-autoregressive processes that will be useful for the proof of Theorem 1. We consider the cone of constant functions

$$D_1 = \{f \in \mathcal{F}; \forall t \in \mathbb{Z}, f(t) = f(0)\},$$

the cone of Dirac functions

$$D_0 = \{f \in \mathcal{F}; \exists t_0 \in \mathbb{Z}, \forall t \in \mathbb{Z}, f(t) = f(t_0)1_{\{t=t_0\}}\},$$

and also, for $a \in (0, 1)$, the cone

$$D_a = \{f \in \mathcal{F}; \exists t_0 \in \mathbb{Z}, \forall t \in \mathbb{Z}, f(t) = f(t_0)a^{t-t_0}1_{\{t \geq t_0\}}\}.$$

Proposition 6. *Let η be a simple max-stable process with representation (4) and assume that η is stationary. Then, the following statements are equivalent:*

- i) η has the same distribution as the max-AR(1) process X_a defined by (1),
- ii) $\mathbb{P}[Y \in D_a] = 1$.

Proof. We note μ' the exponent measure of X_a . For $a \in [0, 1)$, Equation (1) implies that $X_a = \vee_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} F_n f_a(\cdot - n)$ with $f_a(t) = (1 - a)a^t 1_{\{t \geq 0\}}$, whence we deduce that μ' is given by

$$\mu'[A] = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_0^\infty 1_{\{u f_a(\cdot - n) \in A\}} u^{-2} du, \quad A \subset \mathcal{F}_0 \text{ measurable.}$$

For $a = 1$, it holds $X_a = F_0 f_1$ with $f_1(t) \equiv 1$, so that

$$\mu'[A] = \int_0^\infty 1_{\{u f_1 \in A\}} u^{-2} du, \quad A \subset \mathcal{F}_0 \text{ measurable.}$$

In both cases, μ' is clearly supported by the cone of functions D_a . This implies that if Y' is a spectral process associated to X_a , then $\mathbb{P}[Y' \in D_a] = 1$.

We now prove the implication $i) \Rightarrow ii)$. If η has the same distribution as the max-AR(1) process X_a , then the spectral processes Y and Y' are equivalent and Proposition 2 implies $\mathbb{P}[Y \in D_a] = 1$.

We finally prove the converse implication $ii) \Rightarrow i)$. We assume that $\mathbb{P}[Y \in D_a] = 1$ and we apply Lemma 1. Note that D_a is equal to the smallest shift invariant cone containing f_a and denoted by $C_{inv}(f_a)$. The spectral processes Y and Y' are Brown-Resnick stationary processes such that $\mathbb{P}[Y \in C_{inv}(f_a)] = \mathbb{P}[Y' \in C_{inv}(f_a)] = 1$. Lemma 1 entails that Y and Y' are equivalent, which means that η and X_a have the same distribution. $\square$

3.3 Proof of Theorem 1

Let η be a simple max-stable process with representation (4). We assume that η is stationary and satisfies the Markov property. According to Proposition 5 with $t = 0$, $t_1 = -1$ and $t_2 = 1$, it holds

$$\mathbb{P}[Y(-1) = \alpha_{0,-1}Y(0) \mid Y(0) > 0] = 1 \text{ or } \mathbb{P}[Y(1) = \alpha_{0,1}Y(0) \mid Y(0) > 0] = 1.$$

Two cases naturally appear:

- Case 1: $\mathbb{P}[Y(1) = \alpha_{0,1}Y(0) \mid Y(0) > 0] = 1$.
We will prove below that, in this case, η is a max-AR(1) process (1) with parameter $a = \alpha_{0,1}$. To this aim, we use the characterization of max-AR(1) processes given by Proposition 6 so that it is enough to prove $\mathbb{P}[Y \in D_a] = 1$. Note that $a \in [0, 1]$ since $a = \alpha_{0,1} = \mathbb{E}[Y(1)1_{\{Y(0) > 0\}}]$.
- Case 2: $\mathbb{P}[Y(-1) = \alpha_{0,-1}Y(0) \mid Y(0) > 0] = 1$.
We prove that, in this case, η is a time reversed max-AR(1) process (2) with parameter $a = \alpha_{0,-1}$. This is easily deduced from case 1 since the time reversed process $\check{\eta} = (\eta(-t))_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is a stationary simple max-stable process satisfying the Markov property. The associated spectral process $\check{Y} = (Y(-t))_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ satisfies $\mathbb{P}[\check{Y}(1) = \alpha_{0,-1}\check{Y}(0) \mid \check{Y}(0) > 0] = 1$, so that $\check{\eta}$ is a max-AR(1) process with parameter $a = \alpha_{0,-1}$.

Thanks to the discussion above, the proof of Theorem 1 is reduced to the proof of the following statement:

$$\text{If } \mathbb{P}[Y(1) = aY(0) \mid Y(0) > 0] = 1, \text{ then } \mathbb{P}[Y \in D_a] = 1. \quad (11)$$

We consider three different cases: $a \in (0, 1)$, $a = 0$ and $a = 1$.

Proof of (11) in the case $a \in (0, 1)$:

We define the cone $C \subset \mathcal{F}$ by

$$C = \{f \in \mathcal{F}; f(0) > 0 \Rightarrow f(1) = af(0)\}.$$

The property $\mathbb{P}[Y(1) = aY(0) \mid Y(0) > 0] = 1$ implies $\mathbb{P}[Y \in C] = 1$. Since η is stationary, Y is Brown-Resnick stationary and Proposition 2 implies

$$\mathbb{P}\left[Y \in \bigcap_{s \in \mathbb{Z}} \theta_s(C)\right] = 1. \quad (12)$$

Clearly, $\bigcap_{s \in \mathbb{Z}} \theta_s(C)$ is equal to the set of functions

$$\{f \in \mathcal{F}; \forall s \in \mathbb{Z}, f(s) > 0 \Rightarrow f(s+1) = af(s)\}.$$

For such a function f , we easily prove by induction that $f(t_0) > 0$ implies $f(t) = f(t_0)a^{t-t_0}$ for all $t > t_0$. Then, if $t_0 = \min\{t \in \mathbb{Z}; f(t) > 0\} > -\infty$, $f(t) = f(t_0)a^{t-t_0}1_{\{t \geq t_0\}}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{Z}$, and $f \in D_a$. Otherwise, if $t_0 = \min\{t \in \mathbb{Z}; f(t) > 0\} = -\infty$, $f(t) = f(0)a^t$ for all $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ and f belongs to the cone D'_a generated by the power function $t \mapsto a^t$. This proves

$$\bigcap_{s \in \mathbb{Z}} \theta_s(C) = D_a \cup D'_a.$$

So Equation (12) is equivalent to $\mathbb{P}[Y \in D_a \cup D'_a] = 1$. In order to prove $\mathbb{P}[Y \in D_a] = 1$, it remains to prove that $\mathbb{P}[Y \in D'_a \setminus D_a] = 0$. Note that all function $f \in D'_a \setminus D_a$ is of the form $f(t) = ua^t$, $u > 0$ and satisfies $\lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} f(t) = +\infty$. Hence,

$$\mathbb{P}[Y \in D'_a \setminus D_a] \leq \mathbb{P}[\lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} Y(t) = +\infty] = 0$$

where the last equality is a consequence of (3). This proves Equation (11).

Proof of (11) in the case $a = 1$:

First we prove that

$$\mathbb{P}[Y(1) = Y(0) \mid Y(0) > 0] = 1 \quad \text{implies} \quad \mathbb{P}[Y(-1) = Y(0) \mid Y(0) > 0] = 1.$$

To see this, we note that $\mathbb{P}[Y(1) = Y(0) \mid Y(0) > 0] = 1$ if and only if $\mathbb{P}[Y \in C] = 1$ with $C = \{f \in \mathcal{F}; f(0) > 0 \Rightarrow f(1) = f(0)\}$. Since Y is Brown-Resnick stationary, Proposition 2 implies $\mathbb{P}[Y(\cdot - 1) \in C] = 1$, which yields $\mathbb{P}[Y(0) = Y(-1) \mid Y(-1) > 0] = 1$. Then, Equation (3) entails

$$\mathbb{E}[Y(-1)1_{\{Y(-1)=Y(0)\}}] = \mathbb{E}[Y(0)1_{\{Y(-1)=Y(0)\}}] = 1.$$

We deduce $\mathbb{E}[Y(0)1_{\{Y(-1) \neq Y(0)\}}] = 0$ which implies

$$\mathbb{P}[Y(-1) = Y(0) \mid Y(0) > 0] = 1.$$

Consider the cone

$$C = \{f \in \mathcal{F}; f(0) > 0 \Rightarrow f(1) = f(-1) = f(0)\}.$$

The conditions

$$\mathbb{P}[Y(1) = Y(0) \mid Y(0) > 0] = \mathbb{P}[Y(-1) = Y(0) \mid Y(0) > 0] = 1$$

implies $\mathbb{P}[Y \in C] = 1$, whence Proposition 2 yields

$$\mathbb{P}\left[Y \in \bigcap_{s \in \mathbb{Z}} \theta_s(C)\right] = 1.$$

Clearly, $\bigcap_{s \in \mathbb{Z}} \theta_s(C)$ is equal to the cone of functions

$$\{f \in \mathcal{F}; \forall s \in \mathbb{Z}, f(s) > 0 \Rightarrow f(s+1) = f(s-1) = f(s)\}.$$

One can easily prove by induction that this is the cone D_1 of constant functions. This proves Equation (11).

Proof of (11) in the case $a = 0$:

According to Proposition 4, $\mathbb{P}[Y(1) = 0 \mid Y(0) > 0] = 1$ if and only if $\eta(0)$ and $\eta(1)$ are independent. Let $t \geq 2$. By the Markov property, $\eta(0)$ and $\eta(t)$ are independent conditionally on $\eta(1)$. But since $\eta(0)$ and $\eta(1)$ are independent, this implies that $\eta(0)$ and $\eta(t)$ are independent. Hence $\eta(0)$ and $\eta(t)$ are independent for all $t \geq 1$ and by the stationarity of η , $\eta(t)$ and $\eta(t')$ are independent for all $t \neq t'$. Using Proposition 4 again, we deduce

$$\mathbb{P}[Y(t') = 0 \mid Y(t) > 0] = 1 \quad \text{for all } t \neq t',$$

and also

$$\mathbb{P}[\forall t' \neq t, Y(t') = 0 \mid Y(t) > 0] = 1.$$

This implies that the set where Y is non zero has almost surely at most one point. Equivalently, $\mathbb{P}[Y \in D_0] = 1$ and Equation (11) is proved.

4 Continuous time setting

We consider in this section an extension of Theorem 1 to the continuous time framework.

For $a \in (0, 1)$, we denote by $g_a(t) = -\log(a)a^t 1_{\{t \geq 0\}}$ the power function. The constant $-\log(a)$ ensures the normalization $\int_{\mathbb{R}} g_a(t) dt = 1$. We consider the moving maximum process

$$Z_a(t) = \bigvee_{i \geq 1} U_i g_a(t - T_i), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (13)$$

where $\{(U_i, T_i); i \geq 1\}$ is a Poisson point process on $(0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{R}$ with intensity $u^{-2} du dt$. The time reversed process $\check{Z}_a$ is defined similarly by

$$\check{Z}_a(t) = \bigvee_{i \geq 1} U_i \check{g}_a(t - T_i), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (14)$$

with $\check{g}_a(t) = -\log(a)a^{-t} 1_{\{t < 0\}} = g_a(-t^-)$. We use here a slightly different notion of time reversal so that the function $\check{g}_a$ is càd-làg.

For $a = 1$, we define $Z_1 = \check{Z}_1$ a process with constant path and such $Z_1(0)$ has a standard 1-Fréchet distribution.

Lemma 2. *The processes Z_a and $\check{Z}_a$ are stationary simple max-stable processes satisfying the Markov property and with càd-làg sample paths.*

Proof of Lemma 2. The result is straightforward when $a = 1$. For $a \in (0, 1)$, the process Z_a is a moving maximum process with shape function g_a satisfying $\int_{\mathbb{R}} g_a(t) dt = 1$ and is hence a stationary simple max-stable process. The sample paths are càd-làg because the shape function g_a is càd-làg and satisfies $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \sup_{|z| \leq M} g_a(t+z) dt < \infty$ for all $M > 0$.

Straightforward computations yield that for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$

$$Z_a(t+s) = a^s Z_a(t) \bigvee F_a(t, s), \quad s \geq 0, \quad (15)$$

with

$$F_a(t, s) = \bigvee_{i \geq 1} U_i g_a(t+s-T_i) 1_{\{T_i > t\}}. \quad (16)$$

Note that for $t' \leq t$, $Z_a(t')$ depends only on the points (U_i, T_i) such that $T_i \leq t'$ while $F_a(t, s)$ depends only on the points (U_i, T_i) such that $t+s \geq T_i > t$. This implies that $(Z_a(t'))_{t' \leq t}$ and $(F_a(t, s))_{s \geq 0}$ are independent processes. This together with Equation (15) implies that the process Z_a satisfies the Markov property.

The similar statements for the time reversed process $\check{Z}_a$ are proved in the same way and we omit the details. $\square$

Theorem 1 extends to continuous time processes as follows.

Theorem 3. *Any stationary simple max-stable process $\eta = (\eta(t))_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ with càd-làg sample paths and satisfying the Markov property is equal in distribution to Z_a or $\check{Z}_a$ for some $a \in (0, 1]$.*

Equality in distribution is meant in the sense of equality of laws in the Skorohod space $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ with the J_1 -topology. If the max-stable Markov process is η is not supposed càd-làg but only continuous in probability, the result still holds in the sense of equality of the finite dimensional distributions.

For the proof of Theorem 3, the following Lemma will be useful.

Lemma 3. *For all $\varepsilon > 0$, the discrete time process $Z_a^\varepsilon = (Z_a(\varepsilon t))_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is a max-AR(1) process with parameter a^ε .*

Proof of Lemma 3. The random variable $F_a(t, s)$ given by (16) has a 1-Fréchet distribution with scale parameter $1 - a^s$ since

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[F_a(t, s) \leq x] &= \mathbb{P}\left[\bigvee_{i \geq 1} U_i g_a(t+s-T_i) 1_{\{T_i > t\}} \leq x\right] \\ &= \exp\left(-\int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_0^{+\infty} 1_{\{u(-\log(a))a^{t+s-\tau} > x\}} 1_{\{t < \tau \leq t+s\}} u^{-2} du d\tau\right) \\ &= \exp\left(-(1-a^s)/x\right). \end{aligned}$$

Using this, one proves easily that the random variables $F_t = F_a(\varepsilon t, \varepsilon)/(1-a^\varepsilon)$, $t \in \mathbb{Z}$, are i.i.d. with standard Fréchet distribution. Equation (15) entails

$$Z_a^\varepsilon(t+1) = a^\varepsilon Z_a^\varepsilon(t) \bigvee (1-a^\varepsilon)F_t, \quad t \in \mathbb{Z}$$

so that Z_a^ε is a max-AR(1) process with parameter a^ε . $\square$

Proof of Theorem 3. The discrete time process $\eta^1 = (\eta(t))_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ extracted from the continuous time process η is a stationary simple max-stable process on $\mathbb{Z}$ satisfying the Markov property. By Theorem 1, it is equal in distribution either to a max-AR(1) process X_a with $a \in [0, 1]$ or a time reversed max-AR(1) process $\check{X}_a$ with $a \in (0, 1)$.

- In the case $\eta^1 \stackrel{d}{=} X_a$ with $a \in (0, 1]$, we prove that $\eta \stackrel{d}{=} Z_a$.
The process $\eta^{1/n} = (\eta(t/n))_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is stationary simple max-stable and Markov. Theorem 1 entails that $\eta^{1/n}$ is either a max-AR(1) process X_{a_n} with $a_n \in [0, 1]$ or a time reversed max-AR(1) process $\check{X}_{a_n}$ with $a_n \in (0, 1)$. Using the relation $(\eta^1(t))_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} = (\eta^{1/n}(nt))_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$, we prove easily that $\eta^{1/n}$ must be a max-AR(1) process with parameter $a_n = a^{1/n}$. Indeed, in all other cases, the process $(\eta^{1/n}(nt))_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is not a max-AR(1) process with parameter a . By Lemma 3, the process $Z_a^{1/n}$ is also a max-AR(1) process with parameter $a^{1/n}$ so that the processes $(\eta(t/n))_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ and $(Z_a(t/n))_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ have the same distribution. Since this holds true for all $n \geq 1$, we easily see that, for all rational numbers $t_1, \dots, t_p \in \mathbb{Q}$, the random vectors $(\eta(t_1), \dots, \eta(t_p))$ and $(Z_a(t_1), \dots, Z_a(t_p))$ have the same distribution. Together with the property that both η and Z_a have càd-làg sample paths, this implies that η and Z_a have the same distribution in the Skohorod space $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ (see Billingsley [5] theorem 14.5).
- We show that the case $\eta^1 \stackrel{d}{=} X_0$ can not occur.
Indeed, if $\eta^1 \stackrel{d}{=} X_0$, it holds also $\eta^{1/n} \stackrel{d}{=} X_0$ for all $n \geq 1$. This proves that the random variables $\eta(t)$, $t \in \mathbb{Q}$ are independent with standard Fréchet distribution. This contradicts the fact that η has càd-làg sample paths since the difference $\eta(1/n) - \eta(0)$ should converge in law to zero as $n \rightarrow +\infty$.
- In the case $\eta^1 \stackrel{d}{=} \check{X}_a$ with $a \in (0, 1)$, we prove that $\eta \stackrel{d}{=} \check{Z}_a$.
Indeed, the time reversed process $\check{\eta} = (\eta(-t^-))_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is then stationary simple max-stable and Markov and such that $(\check{\eta}(t))_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is a max-AR(1) process with parameter a . Hence $\check{\eta}$ and Z_a have the same distribution, whence η and $\check{Z}_a$ have the same distribution.

$\square$

References

- [1] R. J. Adler, S. Cambanis, and G. Samorodnitsky. On stable Markov processes. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 34(1):1–17, 1990.
- [2] M. T. Alpuim. An extremal Markovian sequence. *J. Appl. Probab.*, 26(2):219–232, 1989.
- [3] M. T. Alpuim and E. Athayde. On the stationary distribution of some extremal Markovian sequences. *J. Appl. Probab.*, 27(2):291–302, 1990.
- [4] M. T. Alpuim, N. A. Catkan, and J. Hüsler. Extremes and clustering of nonstationary max-AR(1) sequences. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 56(1):171–184, 1995.
- [5] P. Billingsley. *Convergence of probability measures*. John Wiley & Sons Inc., New York, 1968.
- [6] L. de Haan. A spectral representation for max-stable processes. *Ann. Probab.*, 12(4):1194–1204, 1984.
- [7] C. Dombry and F. Eyi-Minko. Regular conditional distributions of max infinitely divisible processes. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 18:1–21, 2013.
- [8] Z. Kabluchko, M. Schlather, and L. de Haan. Stationary max-stable fields associated to negative definite functions. *Ann. Probab.*, 37(5):2042–2065, 2009.
- [9] A. V. Lebedev. Statistical analysis of first-order MARMA processes. *Mat. Zametki*, 83(4):552–558, 2008.
- [10] M. D. Penrose. Semi-min-stable processes. *Ann. Probab.*, 20(3):1450–1463, 1992.
- [11] R. Perfekt. Extremal behaviour of stationary Markov chains with applications. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 4(2):529–548, 1994.
- [12] S.I. Resnick. *Extreme values, regular variation and point processes*. Springer Series in Operations Research and Financial Engineering. Springer, New York, 2008. Reprint of the 1987 original.
- [13] M. Schlather. Models for stationary max-stable random fields. *Extremes*, 5(1):33–44, 2002.

- [14] R. L. Smith. The extremal index for a Markov chain. *J. Appl. Probab.*, 29(1):37–45, 1992.
- [15] R. L. Smith, J. A. Tawn, and S. G. Coles. Markov chain models for threshold exceedances. *Biometrika*, 84(2):249–268, 1997.
- [16] L. V. Tavares. An exponential Markovian stationary process. *J. Appl. Probab.*, 17(4):1117–1120, 1980.